1: Swanton E-5 (1911-12)1928 NN11 Creek NN11
Alabama
Koasati

615
614

cat. It is now impossible to say whether the Wildcat clan of the Koasati was originally distinct from the Panther clan of the Alabama, or whether the Koasati merely preferred to use the name Wildcat, the Alabama choosing rather that of Panther. The Beaver and Wind are the clans represented most evenly in the two tribes, though the representatives of the Wind among the Koasati are now deceased.

615
614
582.

From the Alabama and Koasati Indians of Texas and Louisiana I collected records of 95 marriages, exclusive of some unions between Indians and Negroes. This information is contained in the following list, the clan of the male being placed first. Individuals of the Koasati tribe are distinguished by the letter (K), and those of the Pascagoula tribe by the letter (P). The rest are Alabama.

Bear–Daddy-longlegs	5	
Daddy-longlegs–Bear	4	
		9
Deer–Bear	4	
Bear–Deer	2	
		6
Bear–Beaver	4	
Bear–Beaver (K)	1	
Beaver (K)–Bear (K)	1	
		6
Turkey (K)–Beaver (K)	5	
Beaver (K)–Turkey (K)	1	
		6
Turkey (K)–Wildcat (K)	4	
Wildcat (K)–Turkey (K)	2	
		6
Deer–Beaver	1	
Deer–Beaver (K)	1	
Beaver (K)–Deer	3	
		5
Deer–Panther	3	
Panther–Deer	1	
		4
Deer–Daddy-longlegs	2	
Daddy-longlegs–Deer	2	
		4
Bear–Wind	2	
Bear–Wind (K)	2	
		4
Beaver (K)–Wildcat (K)	1	
Wildcat (K)–Beaver (K)	3	
		4
Beaver–Salt	2	
Salt (K)–Beaver (K)	2	
		4
Beaver–Daddy-longlegs	2	
Daddy-longlegs–Beaver	1	
		3
Wind–Panther	2	
Wind (K)–Panther	1	
		3
Panther–Turkey (K)	1	
Panther (K)–Turkey (K)	1	
		2
Deer–Wind	1	
Wind (K)–Deer	1	
		2
Panther (K)–Beaver (K)	1	
Panther–Beaver (K)	1	
		2
Wolf (P)–Wind	1	
Wolf (K)–Wind (K)	1	
		2
Bear–Turkey (K)	1	
Turkey (K)–Bear (K)	1	
		2
Salt–Wildcat (K)		2
Daddy-longlegs–Panther (K)		1
Deer–Alligator (K)		1
Wildcat (K)–Deer		1
Wolf (P)–Panther		1
Bear–Wildcat (K)		1
Wolf (P)–Daddy-longlegs		1
Wolf (P)–Bear		1
Salt–Wind		1
Salt–Turkey (K)		1
Daddy-longlegs–Turkey (K)		1
Beaver (K)–Lost Beaver (K)		1
Panther–Panther		1
Wildcat (K)–Wildcat (K)		1
Bear–Bear		1
Daddy-longlegs–Daddy-longlegs		1
Deer–Choctaw		2
Choctaw–Bear		2
		95

This includes 42 marriages in which both individuals were Alabama Indians, 25 in which both were Koasati, 20 between Alabama and Koasati, 4 between Alabama and Pascagoula, and 4 between Alabama and Choctaw.

1: Swanton | E-5 (1911-12)1928 NN11 Creek NN11

615
614
582

Excluding unions with Choctaw, the number of marriages into which each clan entered is as follows:

Beaver	31	Panther	14
Bear	30	Wind	12
Deer	23	Salt	8
Daddy-longlegs	20	Wolf	5
Turkey	18	Alligator	1
Wildcat	15		

It will now be instructive to ascertain how the marriages of each clan were distributed among the other clans, and this is shown by the following tables:

Beaver–Bear	6 (A, K, A–K)
Beaver–Turkey	6 (K)
Beaver–Deer	5 (A, A–K)
Beaver–Wildcat	4 (K)
Beaver–Salt	4 (A, K)
Beaver–Daddy-longlegs	3 (A)
Beaver–Panther	2 (K, A–K)
Beaver–Lost Beaver	1 (K)
Beaver–Wind	0
Beaver–Wolf	0
Beaver–Alligator	0
	31

Bear–Daddy-longlegs	9 (A)
Bear–Deer	5 (A)
Bear–Beaver	6 (A, K, A–K)
Bear–Wind	4 (A, A–K)
Bear–Turkey	2 (K, A–K)
Bear–Wildcat	1 (A–K)
Bear–Wolf	1 (A–P)
Bear–Bear	1 (A)
Bear–Panther	0
Bear–Salt	0
Bear–Alligator	0
	30

Deer–Bear	6 (A)
Deer–Beaver	5 (A, A–K)
Deer–Panther	4 (A)
Deer–Daddy-longlegs	4 (A)
Deer–Wind	2 (A, A–K)
Deer–Alligator	1 (A–K)
Deer–Wildcat	1 (A–K)
Deer–Turkey	0
Deer–Salt	0
	23

Daddy-longlegs–Bear	9 (A)
Daddy-longlegs–Deer	4 (A)
Daddy-longlegs–Beaver	3 (A)
Daddy-longlegs–Panther	1 (A–K)
Daddy-longlegs–Wolf	1 (A–P)
Daddy-longlegs–Turkey	1 (A–K)
Daddy-longlegs–Daddy-longlegs	1 (A)
Daddy-longlegs–Wildcat	0
Daddy-longlegs–Wind	0
Daddy-longlegs–Salt	0
Daddy-longlegs–Alligator	0
	20

Turkey–Beaver	6 (K)
Turkey–Wildcat	6 (K)
Turkey–Panther	2 (K, A–K)
Turkey–Bear	2 (K, A–K)
Turkey–Salt	1 (A–K)
Turkey–Daddy-longlegs	1 (A–K)
Turkey–Deer	0
Turkey–Wind	0
Turkey–Wolf	0
Turkey–Alligator	0
	18

Wildcat–Turkey	6 (K)
Wildcat–Beaver	4 (K)
Wildcat–Salt	2 (A–K)
Wildcat–Deer	1 (A–K)
Wildcat–Bear	1 (A–K)
Wildcat–Wildcat	1 (K)
Wildcat–Daddy-longlegs	0
Wildcat–Panther	0
Wildcat–Wind	0
Wildcat–Wolf	0
Wildcat–Alligator	0
	15

1: Swanton E-5 (1911-12)1928 NN11 Creek NN11

615
614
582

Panther–Deer	4 (A)
Panther–Wind	3 (A, A–K)
Panther–Turkey	2 (K, A–K)
Panther–Beaver	2 (K, A–K)
Panther–Daddy-longlegs	1 (A–K)
Panther–Wolf	1 (A–P)
Panther–Panther	1 (A)
Panther–Bear	0
Panther–Wildcat	0
Panther–Salt	0
Panther–Alligator	0
	14

Wind–Bear	4 (A, A–K)
Wind–Panther	3 (A, A–K)
Wind–Deer	2 (A, A–K)
Wind–Wolf	2 (K, A–P)
Wind–Salt	1 (A)
Wind–Beaver	0
Wind–Daddy-longlegs	0
Wind–Wildcat	0
Wind–Turkey	0
Wind–Alligator	0
	12

Salt–Beaver	4 (A, K)
Salt–Wildcat	2 (A–K)
Salt–Wind	1 (A)
Salt–Turkey	1 (A–K)
Salt–Bear	0
Salt–Deer	0
Salt–Daddy-longlegs	0
Salt–Panther	0
Salt–Wolf	0
Salt–Alligator	0
	8

Wolf–Wind	2 (K, A–P)
Wolf–Panther	1 (A–P)
Wolf–Daddy-longlegs	1 (A–P)
Wolf–Bear	1 (A–P)
Wolf–Beaver	0
Wolf–Deer	0
Wolf–Wildcat	0
Wolf–Turkey	0
Wolf–Salt	0
Wolf–Alligator	0
	5
Alligator–Deer	1 (A–K)

The data regarding the Wolf and Alligator clans is, of course, of no particular significance owing to the small numbers of representatives of each of these clans and the fact that three of the Wolf clan were Pascagoula Indians. Elsewhere there is an intimation that the Bear, Salt, and Wind may have belonged to the same phratry or clan moiety, and this is to some extent borne out by the above data, only one marriage between individuals of these clans—Salt and Wind—being given. However, the material would seem to indicate a feeling of repugnance to marriage between the Bear, Panther, and Wildcat. That the Panther and Wildcat were considered practically equivalent clans is certain, but it is not often that the Bear is found associated with these. In fact, were it not for the tables I should have had no suspicion of it, nothing of the kind having been suggested by any of my informants. The data bears out their contention that prohibition of intermarriage existed between the Deer and Wolf, the Panther and Wildcat, and the Bear and Salt, although it is too small in amount to be satisfactory. There is now no Skunk clan, and therefore we can not test native opinion that the Skunk and Wind were similarly allied. On the other hand the association which they declare to have existed between the Daddy-longlegs, Beaver, and Turkey is certainly no longer in evidence.

615

I have now touched upon practically all of the more important associations that can be shown with any certainty to have been established between Creek clans. Many others are recorded in my

1: Swanton E-5 (1911-12)1928 NNIl Creek NNI

observer, active and spare, and he forms a kind of outpost for the Bear." 616

An additional reason for the association of wind with peace is the myth that in the beginning of things, at the time when men were first separated into clans, it drove away the mists then enveloping them and revealed them to one another.[52a] 621

These two divisions have not had anything to do with marriage regulations, at least in recent times. I was told that each formed an exogamous group in Koasati, but the Koasati are so reduced in numbers to-day that it is doubtful whether such information may be relied upon. More important was the statement of Jackson Lewis that anciently members of White clans did not intermarry. However, he did not affirm that the same was true of the Tciloki, and his assertion remains practically unsupported. I have a few cases in which exogamous groups are reported including clans belonging to both sides, though further investigation may show this to be an error. Thus in Abihka-in-the-West the Wind and Bear, reported as usual to have been White, are said to have formed one phratry with the Panther which was given as Tciloki. In Asilanabi the Bear and Bird, which were Whites, were united with the Beaver and Alligator, which were Tciloki. In Tuskegee the White Beaver are said to have united with the Tciloki Alligator. In Łapłáko the Bear, Bird, and Beaver are said not to have intermarried, although the first is given as a Tciloki clan in this town and the other two as White clans. In Alabama the Bear and Panther are put together—the former a White clan, the latter a Tciloki. In Okmulgee and Hitchiti the Bird and Beaver are assigned to opposite sides but one phratry, though here, as stated above, I have reason to believe that they were both Tciloki. Among the Yuchi the Wind are said to have been Whites and the Deer and Panther Tciloki, while the three were in one exogamous group. 616 621 582

The white clans undoubtedly had to do with peace, while the others were "bearers of the red sticks" and hence were war clans, but the terms "peace and war" are not given to them as names, nor is the adjective red usually coupled with the Tciloki. There is reason to believe that this dual division had something to do with the dual division of towns to be considered presently, but it is now difficult to make out just what that connection was. At any rate they served one definite purpose, to determine the sides in practice games played within each town, the Whites and Tciloki always forming the two parties. 616 621 526

Among the Texas Alabama, where there has long been but a single town or one or two related villages, practice games were all that could be indulged in. It is to be supposed that in former times they had 616 621 526 177

[52a] See pp. 111-113.

1: Swanton E-5 (1911-12)1928 NNIl Creek NNIl

616 621 526 [177] the same dual division as the other Creeks, but it is now entirely forgotten. In later years, at all events, the men and women played against each other in the two-goal game, something unheard of among the Creeks proper and due without doubt to an entire breakdown of the ancient customs. I was also told that when the men did play against each other the Daddy-longlegs, Bear, and Deer "stood" the other clans. This, however, I believe to have been another modern device, and a suggestion of something more primitive is contained in the statement of one of my oldest informants to the effect that the fathers of the Bear, Salt, and Wind clans always played against the sons of those clans. The others, including evidently the men of those three clans, "divided up any way." The suggestiveness about this lies in the fact that among the Creeks the Bear, Salt, and Wind are usually considered White clans.

[535] As mentioned above, in the tcitahaia or "feather dance" eagle and buzzard feathers were carried by the Tciloki dancers and white crane feathers by those from White clans.

GENERAL REMARKS

614 582 Some general considerations are to be appended regarding the functions of Creek clans and clan aggregates and the customs connected with them. One of my informants remarked that "clans have everything to do with marriage," yet it is evident from what has been said above that in practically none of the towns were all of the exogamous groups identical with single clans. Another asserted that persons of the same clan in unrelated towns could marry, while if the towns were considered branches of one group they could not. This was, however, flatly denied by everyone else, all maintaining that marriage into the clan of the mother was absolutely prohibited, no matter whether the persons concerned belonged to the same town or lived hundreds of miles apart. Marriage into the father's clan was also held in disfavor, and it was said of a man who had done this, "He has fallen into his own [sofki] pot." This regulation was observed by the Texas Alabama as well as the Creeks proper. In ancient times the prohibition may have been more rigorous; later it covered only blood relatives in the father's clan. The assertion is made that marriage was prohibited with anyone related by blood, whether they belonged to the clans of the parents or not. According to some this took in all such persons with whom relationship could still be recognized; according to others it merely extended to the third degree. Such an extension might indeed have been anticipated from the fact that all children of men of the father's clan were called brothers and sisters and the individuals so designated might belong to any exogamous group throughout the tribe. It is said that a man was allowed to marry a woman of another town belonging

1: Swanton E-5 (1911-12)1928 NN11 Creek NN11

to a clan into which he could not marry in his own town, provided that marriage between the clans was allowed in the town to which she belonged. As indicated already, there is no clear evidence that the great dual divisions were ever exogamous as a whole.

Before intertribal wars came to an end the Creeks were in the habit of increasing the size of their clans by adopting captives, especially young people of both sexes.

Slavery was not institutional among the southern Indians as it was with those of the north Pacific coast. The older male captives taken in war, and sometimes the younger ones, were anciently burned. The women and children, unless killed on the spot, were adopted into the tribe and so were those males whose lives had been spared. At the same time there was certainly some onus attaching to their position which may have lasted through life, though it does not appear to have attached to the second generation. Bartram had a good opportunity to observe the condition of slaves among the Seminole and represents their attitude as most abject and servile, but he adds that their children were "free and considered in every respect equal to themselves."[54] He states in this place that "the parents continue in a state of slavery as long as they live,"[55] but elsewhere he partially contradicts himself to the effect that "all slaves have their freedom when they marry, which is permitted and encouraged, when they and their offspring are every way upon an equality with their conquerors,"[56] and just above we read, "I saw in every town in the Nation [of the Creeks] and Seminoles that I visited, more or less male captives, some extremely aged, who were free and in as good circumstances as their masters."[57]

It must be remembered that at the time of which Bartram speaks the Creeks and Seminole had given up the custom of burning their captives, and therefore many were kept alive among them who had formerly been destroyed. The persistence of this less assimilable body of foreigners and the example of slavery among the whites had probably begun to affect the older institution to some extent. At an earlier date the captives taken in war probably formed a less distinct class and were assimilated more rapidly.

Some of the small clans were regarded as inferiors by the others, and this may have been due in some cases to a slave origin, but I have not recorded so much as a tradition to that effect, and the low esteem in which they were held more likely arose in most cases from the incestuous origin often attributed to them.[58] At various times white people have claimed kinship with certain Creek clans. For obvious reasons they have usually been assigned to a White clan, particularly the Wind.

[54] Bartram, Travels, p. 184.
[55] Ibid., p. 211.
[56] For ranking of clans see pp. 43, 213, 214, 223, and Bull. 73, p. 370.

1: Swanton E-5 (1911-12)1928 NN11 Creek NN11

MARRIAGE

582 Accounts of marriage customs among our southern tribes vary so much that we must suppose the same was true of the customs themselves. This variation may have been due to difference in nationality, but it is rarely possible to determine to what groups if any the several accounts belong. The only exceptions are the description by Adair which, as usual, may be assumed to apply mainly to the Chickasaw and the notes by Bossu derived from the Alabama. Adair has the following to say on this subject:

"It is usual for an elderly man to take a girl, or sometimes a child to be his wife, because she is capable of receiving good impressions in that tender state: frequently, a moon elapses after the contract is made, and the value received, before the bridegroom sleeps with the bride, and on the marriage day, he does not appear before her till night introduces him, and then without tapers. . . .

"The Indians also are so fond of variety, that they ridicule the white people, as a tribe of narrow-hearted, and dull constitutioned animals, for having only one wife at a time; and being bound to live with and support her, though numberless circumstances might require a contrary conduct. When a young warrior cannot dress *alamode America*, he strikes up one of those matches for a few moons, which they term *Toopsa Táwah*,[97] 'a make haste marriage,' because it wants the usual ceremonies, and duration of their other kind of marriages. . . .

584 "When an Indian makes his first address to the young woman he intends to marry, she is obliged by ancient custom to sit by him till he hath done eating and drinking, whether she likes or dislikes him; but afterward, she is at her own choice whether to stay or retire. When 585 the bridegroom marries the bride, after the usual prelude, he takes a choice ear of corn, and divides it in two before witnesses, gives her one half in her hand, and keeps the other half to himself; or otherwise, he gives her a deer's foot, as an emblem of the readiness with which she ought to serve him: in return, she presents him with some cakes of bread, thereby declaring her domestic care and gratitude in return for the offals: for the men feast by themselves and the women eat the remains. When this short ceremony is ended, they go to bed like an honest couple.

"Formerly, this was an universal custom among the native Americans; but this, like every other usage of theirs, is wearing out apace. The West-Floridians, in order to keep their women subject to the law of adultery, bring some venison or buffalo's flesh to the house of their nominal wives, at the end of every winter's hunt: that is reckoned a sufficient annual tye of their former marriages, although the husbands do not cohabit with them. The Muskóhge men, if

[97] This should be *tushpa ittasipa*, from *tushpa*, in haste, and *ittasipa*, to marry.

1: Swanton E-5 (1911-12)1928 NN11 Creek NN11

Reed, which she sticks down by the side of his, when they are married; then they exchange Reeds, which are laid by as evidences or certificates of the marriage, which is celebrated with feasting, music and dancing; each one of their relations and friends, at the wedding, contributes something towards establishing the new family. As soon as the wedding is over, the town is convened, and the council orders or recommends a new habitation to be constructed for the accommodation of the new family; every man in the town joins in the work, which is begun and finished in a day's time. 585

"The greatest accomplishments to recommend a young man to his favourite maid, are to prove himself a brave warrior, and a cunning, industrious hunter.

"They marry only for a year's time, and, according to ancient custom, at the expiration of the year they renew the marriage; but there is seldom an instance of their separating after they have children. If it should so happen, the mother takes the children, under her own protection, though the father is obliged to contribute towards their maintenance during their minority and the mother's widowhood.

"The Musogulges allow of polygamy in the utmost latitude; every man takes as many wives as he chooses, but the first is queen, and others are handmaids and associates. [595]

"It is common for a great man amongst them, who has already half a dozen wives, if he sees a child of eight or nine years of age, who pleases him, and he can agree with her parents or guardians, to marry her and take her into his house at that age."[5] [582]

Swan also recognizes that there was a diversity in marriage rites: 584

"Courtship is always begun by proxy. The man, if not immediately acquainted with the lady of his choice, sends her his talk (as it is termed), accompanied with small presents of clothing, by some woman of her acquaintance. If the young woman takes his talk, his proxy then asks the consent of her uncles, aunts, and brothers (the father having no voice or authority in the business), which being obtained, the young woman goes to him, and they live together during pleasure or convenience. This is the most common mode of taking a wife, and at present the most fashionable. 585

"But if a man takes a wife conformably to the more ancient and serious custom of the country, it requires a longer courtship, and some established formalities.

"The man, to signify his wishes, kills a bear with his own hands, and sends a panful of the oil to his mistress. If she receives the oil, he next attends and helps her hoe the corn in her field; afterwards plants her beans; and when they come up, he sets poles for them to run upon. In the meantime he attends her corn, until the beans

[5] Bartram, Travels, pp. 513-513.